

Remarks

Claims 1-27 are pending in this application. Independent claims 1, 13, 26, and 27 have been amended to more particularly point out the invention.

The cited prior art fails to describe or suggest the following features: the amended claims clarify that context resources in a channel adapter of the first node used to service the data access task are pre-emptible after only partial completion of the data access task between the first response and a first subsidiary request for use to support other data access tasks by the channel adapter performing a context switch. The amended claims further clarify that context resources in the channel adapter used to service the data access task are pre-emptible between a subsidiary response and a subsequent subsidiary request for use to support other data access tasks by the channel adapter performing a context switch. Independent claim 25 recites "pre-empting context resources associated with issuance of the first remote access command from the first node prior to completion of the task associated with the first remote access command; and issuing a second remote access command from the first node using the pre-empted context resources."

Claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha (US Pub. No. 2004/0117375) in view of Boyd (US Pub. No. 2004/0049580).

Saha describes direct memory access for performing database operations between two or more machines. The Examiner directs particular attention to Figure 5 and paragraph 60, which describes a series of data transfers and acknowledgments. In Saha, each data transfer is followed by an acknowledgment when all of the data held in the buffer is used. Upon receiving the acknowledgment, the client can then place more data into the buffer.

The Examiner acknowledges that Saha does not disclose a data access task. The Examiner relies on Boyd as a secondary reference. Boyd does describe work queue entries. However, the work queue entries in Boyd do not involve subsidiary requests and responses as claimed. That is, Boyd discloses a work queue entry, but does not disclose a data access task as

claimed. The claimed data access task is partially completed by the first response and further completed by each subsidiary response. There is no such teaching in Boyd.

For teaching pre-emption, the Examiner only relies on Saha. The portions of Saha referred to by the Examiner do not describe such pre-emption, but only describe data buffering in a series of separate data transfers and acknowledgments. That is, there is no pre-emption of context resources, the client only places more data into a buffer when the buffer is empty without the occurrence of any pre-emption.

In the Office Action mailed January 27, 2010, in response to Applicants' previous arguments, the Examiner refers to the memory blocks in Saha. The Examiner notes the broadness of the claimed context resources.

Amended claims 1, 13, 26, and 27 clarify that the context resources in a channel adapter of the first node are pre-emptible by the channel adapter performing a context switch. With this clarification, the cited prior art fails to teach the claimed subject matter. Saha fails to teach a channel adapter performing a context switch to pre-empt context resources in the channel adapter of the first node to support other data access tasks as claimed. The Examiner only refers to the DMA transfer and memory blocks in Saha. There is no teaching of the particularly claimed subject matter. In the same way, independent claim 25 recites pre-empting context resources prior to completion of the task associated with the first remote access command. This claimed subject matter is not described or suggested in the prior art.

At most, the Examiner refers to memory blocks in Saha being emptied to support subsequent tasks or other data blocks of the same task. In contrast, the claimed invention relates to pre-empting context resources in a channel adapter of the first node by performing a context switch in the channel adapter (claims 1, 13, 26, and 27); and pre-empting context resources prior to completion of the task and issuing a second remote access command (claim 25). Accordingly, claims 1-11, 13-23, and 25-27 are believed to be patentable.

Claims 12 and 24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saha in view of Boyd, further in view of Turner. Claims 12 and 24 are dependent claims and are also believed to be patentable.

Please charge any fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,

Pazhani Pillai et al.

By /Jeremy J. Curcuri/
Jeremy J. Curcuri
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: 04/27/2010

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351